(b) if so, what are the reason for which India do not prefer to sell their goods to such parties/countries directly and eliminate the commission of Bofors for its services;

(c) whether it is also a fact that Bofors could do better trade for India than STC; if not, what was the compulsion to involve Bofors in India's trade with other countries; and

(d) what is the estimated amount of trade under the M.O.U.?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): (a) to (d) Under the M.O.U., Bofors and their nominees are allowed to sell the goods to other countries, subject to certain restriction on destination. India prefers to sell directly as much goods as possible to other countries. The purchases to be made by Bofors open up further outlets for Indian goods. No commission is payable by STC to Bofors for its services.

STC has a wide marketing network for exports. M/s. Bofors will fulfill the obligations for counter trade under the MOU signed with STC, thereby providing additional outlet for Indian goods.

In terms of the MOU, contracts for Rs. 17.89 crores for export of Indian goods have been concluded and exports worth Rs. 6.19 crores effected till 15th February, 1988. By March 1995, total exports from India are expected to be approximately Rs. 800 crores.

Export to Japan

*196. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that during his visit to this country sometime in November, 1987, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Japan, Mr. Hiroshi Kitamura had suggested to the Government of India to take advantage of the appreciation of the Yen and lower tariff barriers to push up exports to Japan;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof; and

(c) what follow-up action has been taken by Government in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): (a) and (b) During the official level trade talks in November, 1987, the Deputy Minister of Japan Mr. Hiroshi Kitamura briefly indicated the recent changes in the Japanese economy as a result of the Appreciation of the Japanese yen. He stated that the Japanese Government had initiated policies to promote imports and to improve market access into Japan. This included dismantling of non-tariff barriers and improvements in GSP.

(c) Follow-up action by Government includes initiation of export promotion measures for items for which market access into Japan has been improved as well as encouraging Japanese companies to invest in export-oriented projects in India.

Deployment of Helicopter for Anti-Smuggling Operations in Rajasthan

*197. SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in December, 1987, the Prime Minister had announced that helicopters would be provided to the Border Security Force for anti-smuggling operations;

(b) if so, how many helicopters have since been provided to the BSF and deployed in the Rajasthan sector for the purpose; and

(c) if the helicopters have not yet been provided, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): (a) to (c) The Prime Minister has mentioned about the desirability of providing some light fixed

Wing Patrol aircraft to upgrade operational capability of the BSF. A scheme for this purpose is under consideration.

*198. [*Transferred to the 14th March*, 1988].

Investment by Non-Resident Indians

199. SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of foreign exchange so far earned by the country as a result of investment by the Non-Resident Indians in India;

(b) what are the incentives given to Non-Resident Indians for investing in India; and

(c) whether Government propose to introduce any new incentives?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The investments made by Non-Resident Indians in different Schemes since April 1982 upto 31st December, 1987 are as follows:—

(*Rupees in crores*)

(i) Direct Investment (Proposals Approved) . . .	1218.85
(ii) Portfolio Investment (Actual purchases of Shares/Debentures)	64.66
(iii) Deposits in Indian Companies	26.40
(iv) Deposits in Bank Accounts (Outstanding balances in NRE/FCNR Accounts) .	9217.48

(b) Non-Resident Indians have been permitted to make investment in India both on repatriation and non-repatriation basis in Equity Shares of Indian Companies. Bank Accounts, Government Securities, Units of Unit Trust of India, National Savings Certificates, etc.

(c) Government have decided to introduce a new scheme of Foreign Currency denominated Bonds/Deposits Certificates for Non-Resident Indians on a non-repatriable basis.

Income Tax and Wealth Tax outstanding against Film Artistes

*200. SHRI KAILASH PATI MISHRA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what are the names of film/cine artistes against whom income-tax/wealth-tax demand of Rs. one lakh or more is outstanding at present;

(b) whether Notices U/s 226(3) of the I.T. Act 1961 have been issued in each case mentioned in part (a) above; if not, what are the reasons therefor; and

(c) what steps have been taken by Government to realise the outstanding demands from the film/cine artistes?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) to (c) The names of film/cine artistes against whom income-tax/Wealth tax demands of Rs. 1 lakh or more are outstanding are given in the attached statement (*See* below).

Notices U/s 226(3) have been issued in a large number of cases. Section 226(3) invests the Income-tax officer with a 'discretion' to direct third parties to pay up amounts due from them to the assessees towards discharge of the latter's tax liabilities. Resort to Section 226 is taken generally in cases where the demand in arrears is undisputed and the taxpayers fail to pay such demands themselves. These notices can be issued only in cases where the department has information about the third parties from whom money is due to the assessees, for example, debtors of the defaulters. The authority first tries to collect the tax dues from the assessees failing which resort is taken to other measures like action under Section 226(3).

In many cases where taxes are outstanding, it is not possible to resort to recovery processes because applications of the assessees are pending for